DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 251 183 PS 014 716

TITLE	Title XX Services--Background Paper. A Working Paper Examining Facts, Issues, and Local Impact of Changes in Federal Policies on and Funding of Human Services. Title XX Services Release #1.
INSTITUTION	Human Services Data Sharing Project--Monroe County, Rochester, NY.
PUB DATE	Oct 82
NOTE	29p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Block Grants; *Budgeting; Day Care; *Federal Government; Local Government; Low Income Groups; *Retrenchment; *Social Services; *Urban Areas; Visiting Homemakers
IDENTIFIERS	Child Protective Service; *New York (Monroe County); *Social Security Act Title XX

ABSTRACT

One of a series of background papers on the effects of new federal approaches to human services in Monroe County, New York, this paper examines the facts, issues, and local impact of changes from 1981 to 1982 in federal funding of Title XX. The document begins with an overview of the program area, including description of the historical background of Title XX, statistics on services offered, the planning process mandated by New York State, federal revenues supporting the program, and Monroe County's expenditures for each service area. Next described are changes in federal fiscal year 1982 due to the establishment of the Social Services Block Grant and partial ameliorations of decreased funding and requirements by actions of the state government. Next, further changes expected in 1983 as a result of the reduced funding request made by the Reagan administration are outlined. As subsequently described, the effects of changes for clients in fiscal year 1982 included reduced services in the areas of day care, home support, and child protective services. Issues of local policy options, conflicting state mandates, and possible future focii of the Human Data Sharing Project are discussed in the final pages. (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Human Services Data
Sharing Project
Monroe County, New York

ED251183

TITLE XX SERVICES--BACKGROUND PAPER*

A working paper examining facts, issues, and local impact of changes in federal policies on and funding of human services.

Federal Cutbacks: Facts/Issues/Local Effects

This is one of a series of background papers intended to provide accurate, objective, and comprehensive information regarding the content and effects of new federal approaches to the funding and delivery of human services at the local level--and specifically focusing on effects in Monroe County. Titles of other papers are listed below.

Each paper covers the following general points:

- Overview of Program Area
- Federal Revenue Support of Program
- Changes Expected in Federal Support
- Effects of Changes on Services/Clients
- Policy/Resource Options
- Next Steps for Data Sharing/Research

Any comments or questions concerning this paper should be raised with the contacts listed on the back of this page. Copies of this and other available working papers may be obtained from the same contacts.

OTHER AVAILABLE BACKGROUND PAPERS IN THIS SERIES

- AFDC [Release #1 (7/82)]
- Food Stamps [Release #1 (10/82)]
- Medicaid [Release #1 (10/32)]

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Dianne Salopek
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 014716

*Note: This paper does not reflect Congressional action on the fiscal year 1983 federal budget.

HUMAN SERVICES DATA SHARING PROJECT
Monroe County, New York

Federal and state government budget cuts and redirections that are occurring are having an effect on the programs of local human service agencies and funders.

To help this community deal with the changes that are taking place, nine local planning and funding organizations have joined together in a project aimed at gathering and sharing data that will help funders and providers in the community plan for the future.

Project sponsors include the City of Rochester; the County of Monroe; the United Way of Greater Rochester; Catholic Charities; the Genesee Ecumenical Ministries; the Jewish Community Federation of Rochester; the Urban League; the Rochester Grantmakers Forum; and the Center for Governmental Research. Information gathered by the group will be shared with the entire community.

Sponsors of the project hope to gather accurate, objective information about specific program changes and how they may be expected to affect needy families and individuals in the region. The project will attempt to build base-line data about the kinds of programs and types of people that will be most severely affected by the cuts.

Program Topics Under Study

AFDC	Services to Elderly
Title XX	Mental Health Services
Medicaid	Public Health
Medicare	CETA/Training
Food Stamps	Housing
Education	Community Development
Cultural Activities	Community Action

TITLE XX SERVICES WORKING PAPER

FOR COMMENTS/QUESTIONS/COPIES OF THIS WORKING PAPER
PLEASE CONTACT:

Name	Telephone #
- Responsible Agency Staff Person W. BURTON RICHARDSON, Director Monroe Co. Dept. of Social Services	442-4000 Ex 2611 or Ex 2612
- Responsible Steering Committee Member TOM TOOLE	454-2770
- Responsible CGRI Staff Person ALAN TADDIKEN	325-6360

TITLE XX SERVICES

Overview of Program Area

Background

Current issues relating to the funding of Title XX services can only be understood in the historical context of Title XX and other federal support for social services. In 1972 Congress and the federal administration were confronted with tremendous increases in the public assistance caseload and with the concurrent mandated social service expenditures that went along with them. This raised questions about who was receiving social services, what effect these services were having on the problems of poverty and depravation, and the possible stigmitization of having to apply for public assistance to receive services.

Partially to buy time and partially to simply control expenditures, the federal government put a ceiling on federal reimbursement for social services programming. From 1972 through 1979 that ceiling was $2.5 billion dollars (although some additional money was available in the later years). The basic ceiling rose to $2.7 billion in the 1979-80 FFY and $2.9 billion in the 1980-81 FFY; it was scheduled to increase by $100 million per year until it reached a permanent ceiling of $3.3 billion in the 1984-85 FFY. The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981 changed the rules of the game and the appropriation for FY 1982 dropped from an anticipated $3.0 billion to $2.4 billion.

Compounding these problems were several related factors. The 1972 federal appropriation of $2.5 billion translated into $220.5 million for New York State. Yet the local Social Service Districts in New York were spending

nearly $390 million for these types of services. Thus from the beginning Title XX was not a new funding stream and, in fact, reduced federal resources available to support social services because of the newly established ceiling (see Comprehensive Social Services Program Plan for New York State, Oct. 1, 1976 to Sept. 30, 1977, p. 36). In addition, population shifts have reduced New York State's share of the Title XX pool and these effects have been compounded by inflationary pressures on staff salaries and the cost of purchasing services. Finally, until 1972 most of the activities carried out in local Departments of Social Services were child welfare activities. Title XX added new responsibilities for adult services, that have been increasing with deinstitutionalization, with a clearer recognition of the vulnerabilities of the adult population, and with an increasing state emphasis on services to adults. Thus the scope of responsibilities has been expanding while available federal resources have been contracting. Enriched state funding under the Child Welfare Reform Act, allowing increased programming for preventive services and some shifting of program costs from 50 percent local to 25 percent local funds, as well as the FY 1982 transfer of Low Income Energy Assistance funds, have cushioned the potentially dramatic effects in FY 1982, without altering the basic direction of change.

Title XX did provide some positive benefits, particularly in terms of process. Up to the implementation of Title XX, the states had an agreement with the federal government for open-ended expenditures without really informing the counties as to what the plan was or what they proposed to spend. Title XX did require the states to develop social service programs and plans and to be responsible for doing the things they laid out in their plans. The counties had an opportunity to participate in this planning

activity and, in Monroe County, to begin working closely with the voluntary sector as well as with other public agencies.

Services Offered

The term "Title XX Services" is intended to include a variety of local social services aimed at meeting the following goals for families and individuals:

(1) achieving or maintaining economic self-support to prevent, reduce, or eliminate dependency;

(2) achieving or maintaining self-sufficiency, including reduction or prevention of dependency;

(3) preventing or remedying neglect, abuse, or exploitation of children and adults unable to protect their own interests, or preserving, rehabilitating, or reuniting families;

(4) preventing or reducing inappropriate institutional care by providing for community-based care, or other forms of less intensive care; or

(5) securing referral or admission for institutional care when other forms of care are not appropriate, or providing services to individuals in institutions.

These are the goals established under Title XX of the national Social Security Act. These goals are repeated under Section 2352 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, which amends Title XX. Federal Title XX funds represent the major funding source for the state and local provision of services seeking to achieve the above goals. However, such services are also supported by other federal, state, and local funding sources.

In Monroe County, and typically in any New York State county, the above goals are addressed by the provision of over 20 different services. Such services are provided directly by County Department of Social Services

(DSS) staff and through purchase of service arrangements with various other human service agencies. Federal Title XX funds may also be used to support administrative activities (including planning and evaluation) and training/conference and workshop activities--related to Title XX purposes.[1] See discussion below on mandated services.

In Monroe County, Title XX services are organized within the Department of Social Services--Services Division. There are six core services:

Foster Care - directed at families unable to maintain children in the home and at children needing services not available in the home. Problems addressed include child abuse, neglect, severe family stress, and unmanageable children, and absent parents.

Adoption - directed at children who cannot be maintained in or return to natural families because of abuse, neglect, death of parents, abandonment, etc.

Child Protective - directed at abused/neglected children (with referrals by schools, police, community agencies, neighbors, doctors, etc.).

Adult Protective - directed at adults at risk of institutionalization and/or adults subject to risk because of problems related to health, safety, or exploitation. Deinstitutionalized persons with mental health problems are also a target group here.

Child Preventive - directed at children at risk of foster care placement and at children who can return home from foster care more rapidly (with provision of certain services).

Day Care - directed at child protective and preventive clients, children with incapacitated parents (caretaker on SSI), and at children with surrogate parents (usually grandparents) requiring day care for employment related reasons to prevent need for AFDC support.

For particular clients, these core services, usually involving determination of need and case management by DSS staff teams, are supplemented through purchase of services arrangements. Purchased services include:

counseling; day treatment; day services; homemaker, housekeeper/chore services; day care; parent aide; adoption; interpretive services for hearing impaired, etc.

In addition, information and referral services are provided by DSS through a purchase of service arrangement with LIFE LINE--a private, non-profit agency. This service is also supported by other county agencies and the United Way. This is a general information and referral service for the community.

It should be noted that the core services, and the related purchase of service arrangements (including LIFE LINE), are mandated by New York State. Generally, at this time, virtually all clients receiving services are eligible because of state mandates.

In its Proposed Consolidated Services Plan for New York State, the NYSDSS lists the following summary of services mandated by federal and state law:

A. Services Mandated Without Regard to Client Income

1. Information and Referral
2. Protective Services for Children
3. Protective Services for Adults
4. Preventive Services for Children

B. Services Mandated to All Clients Whose Income Falls Within State Specified Limits

1. Adoption Services
2. Foster Care for Children
3. Foster Care for Adults
4. Unmarried Parent Services

C. Other Services Mandated Only Under Certain Conditions

1. Day Care Services for Children
2. Family Planning Services
3. Home Management Services
4. Homemaker Services
5. Housekeeper/Chore Services
6. Housing Improvement Services
7. Health Related Services

It is apparent from this list that state/federal mandates limit the discretion of local government in allocating resources for Title XX. Indeed, Monroe County, in its Consolidated Services Plan, states that: "The resources of this department will be focused increasingly on providing the core mandated services...." This was apparent in 1979 with the start of reductions for day care and home support services for income eligible clients.

Descriptive Statistics

It is clear from the descriptive statistics on the following page that in many areas a decline in the caseload predates major reductions in federal funds. The reductions in foster care (both direct foster family care and, to a lesser degree, indirect care provided by voluntary child care agencies) are the result of an increase emphasis on permanency planning. This has led to the provision of preventive services to keep children out of care or return them home more quickly if they do enter care. It is also responsible for the steady increase in adoptive placements. The reduction in Day Care between 1980 and 1981 is a consequence of both the shift of day care funding to Title IV- A and the elimination of day care for income eligible clients (discussed below).

The caseload has also been dropping fairly steadily in Child Protective Services. Two factors are at work here. First, a decline in the

Title XX Service Statistics

	1979	1980	1981
Child Protective Services			
Total Referrals	3,364	3,183	2,913
Average Monthly Caseload	NA**	2,021	1,620
Adult Services			
Average Monthly Caseload	NA	690	815
Day Care			
Average Monthly Caseload	NA	835	456
WIN			
Average Monthly Caseload	NA	185	159
Foster Care			
Referrals to Intake	728	600	521
Foster Family Care - Average Monthly Number of Children in Caseload*	NA	1,065	956
Indirect Care - Average Monthly Number of Children*	NA	546	518
Adoption			
Total Placements	75	110	128
Average Monthly Number of Children in Caseload	NA	168	162
Number of Subsidy Adoptions - End of Year	NA	255	314

Source: Monroe County Department of Social Services
*1980 figures for last half of year.
**Not Available.

number of CPS referrals. And, second, an intentional effort on the part of the department to close those cases where no further services or monitoring are needed so as to focus on the clients most in need of help.

Title XX Planning Process

Under a five-year demonstration project, the New York State Department of Social Services (NYSDSS) requires local social service departments to prepare a single plan covering a multi-year period. This plan, the Consolidated Services Plan, replaced four plans previously required by state law (i.e., plans covering family and children's services, child protective services, adult protective services, and social services supported by Title XX). Monroe County produced its first plan in 1981 for the period April 1, 1982 through September 30, 1984. The state requires that the local plan include certain elements and analyses. In preparing the plan, the county is required to consider needs assessment data provided by the NYSDSS. The plan covers these major topics: needs assessment and description of services provided; statement of services goals, objectives, and activities; description of unmet needs; various statistical tables of persons served and estimated expenditures; description of public participation in the planning process; and various assurances and other descriptive materials. The plan also contains a statement of the impact of federal reductions.

The Consolidated Services Plan is only one of the products of Monroe County's Title XX planning process--a continuing process involving DSS staff, other county agency and government officials, voluntary human service agency staff, and other interested members of the community. Since the late 1970's, Title XX planning has involved staff and various of the other participants just mentioned in the following activities:

- periodic comprehensive data collection concerning services needs and resources
- client surveys
- professional interviews/surveys
- service program evaluations (staff and independent)
- development/distribution of various supportive reports as input for workshops
- community workshops to identify issues, problems, policies (included ranking of priority issues)
- creation of issue study teams (representing various public and private organizations) to focus on high priority issues
- public hearings

As it has evolved, the Monroe County planning approach has stressed collaboration by agencies, across traditional boundaries (e.g., social services, mental health, juvenile justice), in identifying options and constraints in planning services. The process is aimed at creating a higher level of coordination, cooperation, and evaluative analytic capability--focusing on the development of realistic options. Thus, planning is "undertaken in consideration of options for policy, service delivery methods, and the realities of the constraints facing the decisionmakers."[2]

The specific planning activities involved in creating the current Consolidated Services Plan are described in detail in that plan. The activities included three public hearing, input from the Local Advisory Council (for Title XX services), and work by a Title XX Steering Committee. The Steering Committee (representing nine public and private funding/planning organizations) created four technical task forces--covering Foster Care and Adoption, Preventive Services, Day Care, and Adult Services. These task

forces, composed of technically informed individuals, developed various findings, recommendations, and proposed plans for use in the Title XX Plan.

Thus, the Consolidated Services Plan is a composite document built from the input of many parts of the community. It represents an elaborate community planning process for deciding on how to allocate limited resources for Title XX services. It attempts to conduct a balanced and technically informed process to meet high priority local needs within the context of state mandates. while its results are not without controvetsy, it is generally considered a reasonable approach that has helped to improve the delivery of services as well as the fair and rationale distribution of available resources.

Federal Revenue Support of Program

In a very broad sense, "Title XX" type services receive support from numerous federal, state, and local funding sources. For example, the county's Consolidated Services Plan shows an estimated $76,748,000 in expenditures for the first year of the plan. This includes a variety of services broadly defined as "social services"--but services that are not typically provided under Title XX. The focus in this analysis is on the tradi tonal Title XX funding source (Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance #13.642 Social Services for Low Income and Public Assistance Recipients).

Over the past seven federal fiscal years, Monroe County has had the following federal resources available to it for the provision of Title XX services:

FEDERAL FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR
MONROE COUNTY, NEW YORK

Year	Title XX Federal Reimbursement Ceiling	AFDC Title IV - A Foster Care*
1976	$6,218,898	—
1977	$6,079,013	--
1978	$6,030,162	—
1979	$5,976,614	$ 730,000
1980	$5,877,918	$1,025,338
1981	$5,878,093	$ 743,000
1982	$5,602,421*	$ 710,000

*Includes training which was not included in previous Title XX ceilings. For FY 1981 the federal share of Title XX training was $167,250, thus in effect increasing the ceiling by that amount.
Source: NYSDSS Summary of Proposed Comprehensive Annual Social Services Plans and related documents.

As is apparent, funding from Title XX, the major federal source, has been decreasing. The decrease is attributable both to the formula used to distribute the funds at the national level (based on population) and to the Reagan cutbacks in FY 1982 (discussed below) and to changes in the state allocation formula. (This source involves a 12.5% state and 12.5% local match.) If this source were adjusted for inflation, of course, it would reflect an even more dramatic decline.

In addition to Title XX funds, services are also supported with federal AFDC Title IV - A funds. These funds are used to support case worker costs for foster care, the maintenance costs (room and board) for eligible children in foster care, and day care for AFDC clients who are employed or in approved training programs. This source requires a 25% state and 25% local match. These funds are available based on eligible claims (unlike Title XX funds--which are available for eligible claims only up to the state ceiling).

It is important to note that Title XX services are also supported by various state funding sources, including preventive service funds, state matching funds for expenditures on mandated Title XX Services above the ceiling, and adoption subsidies for "hard to place" children. Each of these services also requires a local match of 25% or 50%. When a county reaches its Title XX ceiling "a series of shifts of claims to other reimburseable programs may occur."[3] A county may succeed in receiving partial reimbursement (at least 50% and up to 75%) for all of its services expenditures--or it may be obliged to pay the full cost of its services expenditures if it spends in excess of state ceilings and cannot otherwise shift the claim because it is not eligible for reimbursement. While data are unclear, it is believed that Monroe County has largely succeeded in receiving at least 50% reimbursement for its Title XX services expenditures--and has avoided paying the full cost for most services.

Monroe County's total expenditures for Title XX services by service area are presented in the table on the following page.

Changes in Federal Fiscal Year 1982

Under the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, a Social Services Block Grant was established. This block grant may be summarized as follows:

- Consolidates Title XX Services and Training into a single Title XX Block Grant
- Authorizes funding at $2.4 billion for FY 1982 (down from approximately $2.9 billion for FY 1981)
- Allows states to determine the types of services to be provided
- Removes requirements for state matching
- Removes requirement that a specific portion of funds must go to welfare recipients

EXPENDITURES FOR TITLE XX SERVICES IN MONROE COUNTY, NEW YORK
BY SERVICE AREA

	ACCOUNT #	1980 BUDGET (1000's)	1980 Projected EXPENDITURES (1000's)	1981 BUDGET (1000's)	1981 Projected EXPENDITURES (1000's)	1982 Estimated BUDGET (1000's)
Social Service Delivery	51-04					
Administration	01	$ 1,260	$ 1,217	$ 1,301	$ 1,283	$ 1,396
Child Care	15	719	679	720	668	742
Child Protective	20	2,061	2,096	2,267	2,268	2,315
Foster Care/Adoption	25	1,577	1,606	1,711	1,750	1,772
Adult Services	30	549	559	602	610	612
Supportive Services	35	1,117	1,064	1,208	1,148	1,248
SUB-TOTAL		7,282	7,221	7,809	7,727	8,085
Social Services Program Purchase of Services:	51-39-45					
Day Care	01	2,807	2,930	2,700	2,253	963
Homemakers	05	468	486	600	400	421
Preventive Services	10	801	716	782	730	1,214
Protective Services	15	780	794	800	686	200
Information & Referral*	25	--	--	118	--	77
SUB-TOTAL		4,856	4,926	5,000	4,069	2,875
GRAND TOTAL		$12,138	$12,147	$12,809	$11,796	$10,960

*The information and referral section was created in 1982 Budget. The 1981 Budget was reclassed for $118,000 from the preventive section.

Source: Monroe County, Department of Social Services, Services Division, November, 1981.

- Removes requirement that services be limited to families with incomes below 115% of state median income

- Allows a transfer of up to ten percent of the block grant allotment to either health or energy assistance block grant programs

- Allows other block grant funds to be used to support Title XX services

- Removes requirement for a state plan

In federal FY 1982, New York State received $184.9 million to fund the Title XX Block Grant Program--a decrease of $59 million or nearly 25% from the FY 1981 allocation (this loss presumably reflects the workings of the Title XX distribution formula as well).[4]

For the FY 1982 Title XX period, New York State responded, as follows[5]:

- NYS Legislature passed a statute requiring that 98% of Title XX funds (i.e., $181.2 million) be allocated to local districts (i.e., counties and NYC)--two percent could be retained by the NYSDSS for training purposes.

- The statute also requires the maintenance of state matching funds at the level appropriated in federal FY 1981.

- NYDSS transferred $10 million of federal Low Income Energy Assistance funds to the Title XX Block Grant monies to be distributed to the local districts.

- NYDSS allocated a total of $191.2 million ($181.2 million Title XX plus $10 million Low-Income Energy Assistance) in federal funds to the local districts using a formula based on 1972 county populations and services expenditures--with a floor established preventing reductions in a given district below certain limits (see NYSDSS, "An Explanation of the Methodology Used for the Allocation of $191.2M of Federal Funds to Local Districts for Title XX Services, Administration, and Training in Federal Year 1982," March 1982 or New York State, Consolidated Services Plan, April, 1982).

- NYSDSS has maintained its mandated services requirements and its planning requirements.

- NYSDSS promulgated guidelines concerning how reductions in services should be undertaken:
  - first priority to maintain child/adult protective services
  - second priority to maintain services which alleviate the need for more restrictive service interventions
- NYSDSS urged local districts to maximize use of alternative funding sources, especially Title XIX (Medicaid) for family planning and home care services.

Monroe County, as previously indicated, received an allocation of $5,602,421 for federal FY 1982. This represents a loss of $275,672 from the FY 1981 allocation of $5,878,093. Monroe County's Title XX Consolidated Services Plan indicates an adjusted[6] loss of $442,922. (The service effects of this loss are discussed below.)

Changes in Federal Fiscal Year 1983

The Reagan Administration's FY 1983 budget proposal for the Social Services Block Grant (Title XX) may be summarized as follows:

- Requests budget authority for $1.974 billion for FY 1983 (down from $2.4 billion in FY 1982)
- Permits states to continue the Work Incentive Program (WIN)[7] with resources from the Social Services block grant (the regular WIN program would be phased out--in FY 1982 WIN had budget authority of $246 million and in FY 1981 authority was set at $365 million).

The Governor's Task Force[8] on the Federal Budget estimates that New York's FY 1983 allocation, under the Reagan budget proposal, would be $153 million--a loss of approximately $32 million from FY 1982. The Task Force states:

"While New York has been able to lessen the impact of these reductions through use of other funding sources in fiscal

year 1982, additional reductions in federal funds will make maintenance of existing levels of services impossible. Reductions in critical services such as protective services for children and adults must be anticipated."

Thus, if the Reagan cuts in Title XX are approved, and New York State does not supplement the available federal funds, Monroe County would stand to lose approximately $1 million--an 18% loss over FY 1982.

Documentation of Congressional action on the FY 1983 budget proposal was not available in time for inclusion in this paper. It will be reflected in a later release.

Effects of Changes: Services/Clients

Management Capacity

During federal FY 1982, no significant impacts on management capacity (i.e., supervisory and administrative staff, program planning and evaluation, systems and technical support, etc.) are expected. The department did lose one day care team and one child protective team, as discussed below.

However, during federal FY 1983, if the county suffers a loss of an additional $1 million beyond FY 1982 cuts, it is likely that services management would have to be reduced in administrative, supervisory, and support areas. In addition, the department anticipates losing its WIN Unit in FFY 1983.

Direct Services

For federal fiscal year 1982, Monroe County's Consolidated Services Plan describes direct service effects of federal Title XX reductions. The reduction in the county budget for Title XX services between 1981 and 1982 was $1,839 million. Almost all of the reductions occurred in three areas:

- day care
- home support services (homemaker and housekeeper/chore)
- child protective services

The Consolidated Services Plan explains the reductions as follows:

> Day Care. "The day care reductions were $1,451,000. This reflected four factors. First, the elimination of day care for income eligible clients that was implemented in July, 1981. Second, a reduction in the contracted cost of Day Care Management Services and Central Intake, both of which served group day care needs. Third, the elimination of one day care team. And, fourth, an expectation that our own remaining day care staff would be spending an increasing proportion of their time working directly with Child Protective and Preventive Clients."
>
> Home Support. "The reductions in Home Support Services were $188,000, reflecting the changes in eligibility that were instituted in July, 1981."
>
> Child Protective. "The initially planned reductions in Child Protective Services of $159,000 reflected the loss of one CPS management team and shifting in purchased services from Protective to Preventive funding. These reductions were partially offset by the expected increase in the degree to which day care workers would have direct involvement in Child Protective cases."

It is apparent that these reductions (approximately $1.8 million) represent a change in county policy toward investment in Title XX services, as well as a response to the loss of approximately $520,000 in federal/state aid in FY 82. This observation needs to be understood within the context of the relatively high level of support for Title XX services in Monroe County. An exhibit at the end of this paper compares Monroe County to other major urban counties. This comparison shows that Monroe County has the highest per capita expenditures among these counties for total expenditures and the second highest for expenditure of local funds.

The 1982 county budget reflects a significant drop in the level of Title XX purchase of service arrangements:

PURCHASE OF SERVICES

Calendar Year	Amount (millions)
1979	$4.236 (actual)
1980	$4.925 (actual)
1981	$4.992 (revised)
1982	$3.612 (estimate)*

Source: Monroe County Budgets
*1982 amount is adjusted for a transfer of $737,000 in day care expenditures from Title XX to Title IV.

Much of this change is explained above under the discussion of reductions.

As stated in the Consolidated Services Plan, Monroe County is shifting its resources to providing state mandated services. At the same time the county is attempting both to maximize its reimburseable expenses and stabilize such expenses in the face of continued expected declines in federal and state support.

In federal FY 1983, Reagan cuts would result in even sharper reductions in purchased services--and would almost certainly affect staffing levels in MCDSS core services as well. The Consolidated Services Plan's list of "unmet needs" would grow considerably longer.

An additional complication would occur if the WIN program is phased out, as proposed. Loss of WIN funds would affect eligible AFDC clients--and might further limit funds available for other current Title XX services--assuming that the state and/or county decides to continue a local WIN program.

Effects on Clients---Day Care

Knowledge about the effects of FY 1982 service changes on clients is still very preliminary. Changes in Title XX funding and related local program policy (i.e., not providing day care for income eligible clients) resulted in family day care cuts of approximately 220 children. In addition, about 260 children in group day care lost county subsidy but became eligible for United Way subsidy. This change, to accommodate children from lower income families, required a shift in United Way policy and a loss of United Way day care subsidies for 175 children.

MCDSS and the United Way conducted a study of the impacts of reducing day care for low income clients.[9] The study concluded "that most of the clients had made acceptable alternative child care arrangements even though some of these may have involved substantial changes in the household such as resigning work to stay home, changing work hours, leaving children at home alone after school, or leaving children in the care of an older sibling." (p. i) Other findings were that the day care cuts did not lead to an increase in referrals to Child Protective Services nor did the cuts result in significant numbers of clients resigning work and going on public assistance. Note that these findings must be viewed as preliminary in that the response rates of the client survey components were only 20% to 34% and sufficient time had not elapsed to completely evaluate certain problem areas such as increased dependency and child neglect issues.

Effects on Clients---Home Support Services

Eighty-nine clients lost home support services when the eligibility criteria were changed in July, 1981 to eliminate income eligible clients.

Fifty of these, who were identified as most "at risk", were picked up by other community based programs. The Consolidated Services Plan, effective April, 1982, provides slots for income eligible Adult Protective clients who have exhausted the 6 months of services eligibility without regard to income.

Effects on Clients--Child Protective

To this point, the reductions in Child Protective Services Staff have followed reductions in the caseload. The reductions in purchased services for Child Protective clients have been a consequence of efforts to maximize state reimbursement to the county by shifting contract funding from protective to preventive. Thus, unless there are deeper cuts in FY 83 there should be little effect on clients.

Policy/Resource Options

Faced with continued erosion of federal/state revenues for Title XX services, the following local policy options have been identified:

1. Maintain County Level-of-Effort. An average county level-of-effort for support of Title XX services could be determined. This amount could be used as a guideline for determining a minimum use of county funds to support Title XX services regardless of declines in federal/state levels of financial participation.

2. Maximize Use of State Child Welfare Reform Act Funds. Private sector human service agencies and the United Way could work with MCDSS-Services Division to identify appropriate programming eligible for reimbursement through State Child Welfare Reform Act Funds. Creative use of these funds could increase the level of family-centered preventive services to children at risk of placement in foster care. Such an approach would free-up county funds for use in supporting other Title XX services. The actual significance of this option in terms of incresed service levels needs to be determined.

Issue of State Mandates

A related policy issue concerns the matter of state mandates directing the local use of Title XX funding and other requirements for the

provision of specific services. While the federal government has reduced its specific requirements for Title XX xervices, New York State has continued its mandates. Indeed, as mentioned earlier virtually all Title XX services provided in Monroe County are now mandated services. The issue with mandated services revolves around the logic of the Title XX planning process. As presented in detail above, Monroe County (and all counties in New York State) engages in a rather complex annual planning process intended to establish local needs, set priorities for local social services programming, and develop specific, coordinated service programs. New York State mandates essentially sidestep this planning process by establishing relatively static external requirements that may or may not coincide with local planning findings and objectives. For example, if Monroe County were to follow its current locally established planning objectives, the social services plan would reflect priorities different from the current state mandates and services plan.

The logic of the federal regulatory changes is that states can better determine state priorities. The logic of the state's social services planning process is that counties can better determine local priorities. Thus, the continuation of state mandates as currently detailed is questionable.

A possible direction is to permit county services plans to override state mandates where local evidence has been develop to support new priorities. In this way, local planning would be encouraged and strengthened and social services funds would be better utilized. This is not to say that certain basic state service standards should be eliminated. On the contrary, the state should maintain basic service requirements which must be addressed by local planning. However, if a reasonable local planning effort finds

changed local needs, these should be recognized by the state. If a locality fails to conduct a reasonable planning process, state mandates should prevail. This give-and-take would reduce the arbitrariness of the current arrangements.

A related point concerns the state's treatment of county-level social service training needs. As above, consideration should be given to allowing counties more flexibility in dealing with local training needs.

NEXT STEPS FOR DATA SHARING RESEARCH

The Human Services Data Sharing Project could focus its efforts on several tasks related to cutbacks in federal financial participation in Title XX services. However, it is important to keep in mind that there is an elaborate, well-established Title XX planning process (described above)--a process specifically designed to address prioritization of services needs and resource allocation issues.

1. Analysis of Purchase of Service Contracts. Title XX purchase of service contracts for county fiscal years 1980, 1981, and 1982 would be reviewed. Changes in service levels by target population would be identified. The effects on the various agencies losing contracts would be analyzed.
2. Assist in Further Survey of Clients Losing Day Care. Technical assistance would be provided to improve the design and implement of a survey of clients losing day care subsidies.
3. Clarify Title XX Services Revenues. The level of federal, state, and county revenues supporting Title XX services would be identified and documented in detail. This task might be useful in establishing a

level-of-effort target for use of county-raised funds for support of Title XX services.

4. Assist in Identifying Areas in Which Preventive Services Should be Expanded. Available preventive services are addressed primarily to the needs of families with young children. Technical assistance would be provided to help identify the types of services most appropriate to other age groups, especially adolescents.

FOOTNOTES

[1]As set forth in the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, Section 2352 (Social Services Block Grant Act).

[2]John Farie and William Privett, "Title XX Planning: A Practical Local Approach," in Sharing, Volume 3, Number 2, Spring 1979.

[3]Legislative Commission on Expenditure Review (LCER), Title XX Social Services, Program Audit, March, 1981, p. 12.

[4]State of New York, "Memorandum in Support of an All Funds Appropriation Bill as Required by Chapter 405 and 480 of the Laws of 1981," Division of the Budget, p. 62.

[5]NYSDSS, Office of Program Planning, Analysis, and Development, "A Preliminary Report on the Impact of Reduced Federal Funds in NYS," March 17, 1982.

[6]Adjusted for training funds. The FY 1981 allocation of $5.88 million does not include training.

[7]WIN "is designed to encourage and assist individuals receiving support from the...AFDC program to achieve self-support through a program of employment, training, and support services." (Budget of the U.S. Government, Fiscal Year 1983, p. I-K59). Locally, WIN supportive services are handled by MCDSS-Services Division. The training aspects are handled by NYSDOL.

[8]Governor's Task Force on the Federal Budget, Impact of Federal Fiscal Year 1983 Budget Proposals, March 17, 1982, pp. 32-33.

[9]MCDSS/UW, Cutting Day Care: The Impacts of Reducing Day Care for Low Income Clients, February, 1982.

Revised 10/22/82

Exhibit: Comparative Title XX Experditures

TOTAL EXPENDITURES AND PER CAPITA EXPENDITURES FOR
TITLE XX SERVICES IN SELECTED COUNTIES IN FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR 1980

	Total Expenditures		Per Capita Expenditures	
	Federal, State, and Local*	Local only*	Federal, State, and Local**	Local only**
Monroe	$12,376,165	$2,731,945	$17.62	$3.89
Albany	4,821,042	976,862	16.86	3.42
Westchester	13,121,779	1,748,926	15.14	2.02
Onondaga	7,227,519	1,946,707	15.58	4.20
Suffolk	13,873,472	2,276,522	10.80	1.77
Nassau	12,530,145	1,865,212	9.48	1.41
Erie	9,558,373	1,758,065	9.41	1.73

Source: MCDSS, Services Division
*Expenditure data derived from:
NYSDSS, "Data Concerning Gross Expenditures for Services by Local Social Services Districts in NYS," Aug., 1981.
NYSDSS, Letter from Barbara Blum, Commissioner, to Local District Commissioners, April 2, 1981.
**1980 Census populations